



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

08/960,224 10/29/97 NISHIDA

S 046916

MM92/1205

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER

QI, Z

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2871

6

DATE MAILED:

12/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Office Action Summary

|                                      |                                      |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Application No.<br><b>08/960,224</b> | Applicant(s)<br><b>NISHIDA et al</b> |
| Examiner<br><b>MIKE QI</b>           | Group Art Unit<br><b>2871</b>        |

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

### Disposition of Claim

- Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.  
Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1, 2, 4, and 6-15 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) 3 and 5 is/are objected to.
- Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved.
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

### Attachment(s)

- Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3,4,5
- Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2871

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the article "Principles and characteristics of Electro-Optical Behaviaour with In-plane Switching Mode" (Oh-e et al) in view of US 5,085,973 (Shimizu et al).

Claim 1, Oh-e et al discloses (in the paragraph "Principles of Proposed In-plane Switching Mode" and Fig. 1) a liquid crystal display comprising:  
a first substrate and a second substrate opposed to each other;  
when a predetermined voltage is applied, the predetermined electric field will be generated on the second substrate;

a liquid crystal layer injected in a gap between the pair of substrates;  
the electric field generated by the second substrate being substantially parallel to the liquid crystal layer to control the display.

Art Unit: 2871

Oh-e et al does not disclose expressly the first substrate on which a plurality of color layers having transmission wavelengths different from each other are provided in parallel to each other, and the liquid crystal layer having a thickness which varies depending upon the transmission wavelengths of the color layers, but those limitations were well known. The disclosure of Shimizu et al is an evidence.

Shimizu et al discloses in Fig.1 a liquid crystal panel comprising a first substrate 1 on which a plurality of color filters (red, green and blue, corresponding to the different wavelengths) having transmission wavelengths different from each other are provided in parallel to each other, and the liquid crystal layer having a thickness which varies depending upon the transmission wavelengths of the color filters, so as to improve the contrast.

Therefore, the thickness of the liquid crystal layer varies depending upon the different wavelengths of the color layers as claimed in claim 1 would have been obvious.

Claim 2, as the explanation of Shimizu et al above, Shimizu et al discloses in Fig.1 the thickness of the liquid crystal layer increases in proportional to the wavelength of the corresponding color filter, i.e., the thickness of the liquid crystal layer increases in proportional to the wavelength from blue (460 nm) to red (650 nm), so as to improve the contrast.

Therefore, the limitation as claimed in claim 2 would have been obvious.

Claims 4 and 6, in order to prevent elusion of impurities from the color layers, the first substrate has a protective layer was well known.

Art Unit: 2871

3. Claims 7-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,034,756 (Yuan et al).

Claim 7, all the limitations for an active matrix liquid crystal display panel were well known as the explanation of Oh-e et al above, except for the optical compensation layer.

However, Yuan et al discloses (col.4, line 33-col.6, line 36 and Fig. 8 and 9) a LCD 200 in which the compensating layer 220 is disposed between the one substrate 231 and a corresponding one of the polarizing plates 210, and the compensating layer 220 has negative birefringence (negative refractive index anisotropy), and the axis direction of the compensating layer 220 is parallel to at least one of the polarization axes of the two polarizing plates 210 and 250 as shown in the Fig.9, so as to compensate the liquid crystal layer, and the wide angle viewing performance is greatly improved.

Therefore, the limitations as claimed in claim 7 would have been obvious.

Claims 8-9 and 13, Yuan et al discloses (col.5, lines 29-40 and Fig. 9) the improved performance is a result of each the "layers" L1-L5 of the LC cell 230 being compensated by each of the "layers" L1'-L5' of the compensating layer 220, i.e., the liquid crystal molecules in the LC layer are substantially uniform, and the refractive index anisotropy axis of the compensation layer extends substantially in parallel to the LC molecules directors, so as to achieve the wide view angle improved performance. In this aspect,  $\Delta n \cdot d = \Delta n' \cdot d'$ , where d is the thickness of the LC cell 230 and d' is the thickness of the compensating layer 220, i.e., the  $\Delta n_{LC} \cdot d_{LC} = \Delta n_F \cdot d_F$ , and that is the perfect compensation.

(dow)  
(satisfy certain range)

Art Unit: 2871

Therefore, the limitations as claimed in claims 8-9, and 13 would have been obvious.

*inherent* ? Claim 10 and 14-15, if the perfect compensation achieved, as a result, the refractive index  $n_{LO}$  of the liquid crystal layer for the ordinary light would equal to the refractive index  $n_{FO}$  of the compensation layer.

Therefore, the limitation as claimed in claims 10 and 14-15 would have been obvious.

*inherent* ? Claims 11-12, if the perfect compensation achieved, as a result, the projections of directors of liquid crystal molecules would be parallel to each other and the projection of the refractive index anisotropic axis of the compensation layer would be parallel to the directors of the plane of the liquid crystal layer, and the angles relationship would be  $\theta_1 < \theta_F < \theta_2$ , and the refractive index anisotropic axis of the compensation layer would be parallel to the director of one of the liquid crystal molecules, and the angle  $\theta_F$  would vary in the thicknesswise direction of the compensation layer in corresponding to the director in thicknesswise direction of the liquid crystal layer.

Therefore, the limitation as claimed in claims 11-12 would have been obvious.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

4. Claims 3 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2871

The prior art of record neither teaches nor discloses a liquid crystal display panel comprises various elements, more specifically, as the following:

the distances between the pixel electrodes and the opposing electrodes are different for the individual color layers [claim 3 and 5].

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Qi whose telephone number is (703)308-6213 .

Mike Qi  
November 30, 2000



*Kenneth Parker*  
*Primary Examiner*  
*Technology Center 2800*